

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Steven Allan Byrd,	)	C.A. No. 2:05-3409-TLW-RSC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Chesterfield County;	)	
Chesterfield County Sheriff's Department;	)	
Chris Page;	)	
NFN Gulluge, Judge;	)	
District Attorney's Office;	)	
Jay Hodge;	)	
United States Attorney's Office;	)	
ATF; and	)	
Crig Townson,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

The Plaintiff brought this *pro se* civil rights action against the Defendants, seeking release from the Dillon County Detention Center and monetary damages for alleged “pain and suffering” and “wrongful imprisonment” stemming from Plaintiff’s arrest and subsequent pre-trial confinement on state and federal drug charges.

On December 13, 2005, United States Magistrate Judge Robert Carr, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), filed a Report and Recommendation (“the Report”). In his Report, Magistrate Judge Carr recommends that the Plaintiff’s complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. On December 29, 2005, Plaintiff filed objections to the

Magistrate's Report.

This Court is charged with reviewing the Magistrate's Report and the Plaintiff's objections thereto. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections thereto and has concluded that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 5); Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 6); and Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without prejudice for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

S/ Terry L. Wooten  

---

TERRY L. WOOTEN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

October 15, 2007  
Florence, South Carolina

